



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,112	12/11/2001	Harold Aaron Ludtke	SONY 3.0-020	3954

530 7590 11/04/2005

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 3621

1. Claims 15-52,67-104, 106-108 stand withdrawn from further consideration for reasons of record in paragraph 1 of the Office action dated 12/22/2004 and should be deleted. Applicants arguments dated 08/22/2005 are unpersuasive.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

3. Claims 1,2,5-10,12,14, 109-123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pare, Jr et al(5838812) in view of Dulude et al(6310966) and Kawan (5796832) and either Johnson(5598474), Gerety et al (6560741) or Shinn(6655585).

Regarding claim 1, Pare, Jr et al (See abstract, Figs. 8-11, 24,25, Col. 11, lines 5-57, Col. 14, lines 32-64,Col. 15, lines 20-35, Col. 18, lines 5-55, claims 1, 4) disclose method for employing transaction employing a biometric input

Art Unit: 3621

including intermediaries and transmission of verification substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific automatic transmission of a biometric input and point of comparison. It is noted that it is believed that the biometric parameter(See Col. 8, lines 50-55) are functionally equivalent to the claimed limitations and that the claim as drawn is readable on any the well established biometric based transaction methods. Dulude et al(See Fig. 4, Col. 5, lines 50-65, Col. 6, lines 1-25) show biometric inputs at a transaction point transmitted over a network. Kawan (See abstract, Figs. 1-4, 6, Col. 3, lines 1-30, Col. 4, lines 1-15, Col. 8, lines 50-55, claims 1, 5,19) show a method for wirelessly effecting a transaction employing a biometric input. Each of Johnson(element 20), Gerety et al (Fig. 12) or Shinn(Fig. 5) show the local comparison of biometric data prior to a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Pare, Jr et al because the biometric inputs are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment and comparison is a necessary component of validation and use in a transaction method and because local comparison would reduce fraudulent transactions and save network calls for unverified users. Regarding the device limitations of claim 2, Kawan (See Claim 5) show cell phone which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding

Serial Number: 10/014,112

4

Art Unit: 3621

the device limitations of claim 3, Kawan (See Claim 31) show ATM which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding the information limitations of claim 5, Kawan show point of sale terminal data access which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the information limitations of claim 6, Kawan show point of sale terminal data access which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding the information limitations of claim 7, Kawan(See Col. 4, lines 55-65) show credit authorization terminal and card which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding

the database limitations of claim 8, Dulude et al(element 66) show a database which is a functional equivalent of the claim

limitations. Regarding the database limitations of claim 9, Dulude et al(element 66) show a database which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the fingerprint

limitations of claim 10, Kawan (See Col. 8, lines 50-55) show a fingerprint which is a functional equivalent of the claim

limitations. Regarding the database comparison limitations of claim 12, Dulude et al(See abstract and element 66) show a

database comparison based on biometric generation input and comparison against a stored value which is a functional

equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the visual limitations of claim 14, Dulude et al(See claim 8) show a

database comparison based on biometric generation input and comparison against a stored value which is a functional

Art Unit: 3621

equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the limitations of claim 109, Dulude et al (See abstract and element 66) show a database comparison based on biometric generation input and comparison against a stored value and subsequent verification which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Regarding the network limitations of claim 110, Dulude et al (See Fig. 4, Col. 5, lines 50-65, Col. 6, lines 1-25) show biometric inputs at a transaction point transmitted over a network n which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 111, Pare, Jr et al (See abstract, Figs. 8-11, 24,25, Col. 11, lines 5-57, Col. 14, lines 32-64, Col. 15, lines 20-35, Col. 18, lines 5-55, claims 1, 4) disclose means for employing transaction employing a biometric input including intermediaries and transmission of verification substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific automatic transmission of a biometric input and point of comparison. It is noted that it is believed that the biometric parameter (See Col. 8, lines 50-55) are functionally equivalent to the claimed limitations and that the claim as drawn is readable on any the well established biometric based transaction methods. Dulude et al (See Fig. 4, Col. 5, lines 50-65, Col. 6, lines 1-25) show biometric inputs at a transaction point transmitted over a network. Kawan (See abstract, Figs. 1-4, 6, Col. 3, lines 1-30, Col. 4, lines 1-15, Col. 8, lines 50-55, claims 1, 5, 19) show a means for wirelessly effecting a

Art Unit: 3621

transaction employing a biometric input. Each of Johnson(element 20), Gerety et al (Fig. 12) or Shinn(Fig. 5) show the local comparison of biometric data prior to a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Pare, Jr et al because the biometric inputs are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment and comparison is a necessary component of validation and use in a transaction method and because local comparison would reduce fraudulent transactions and save network calls for unverified users. Regarding the device limitations of claim 112, Kawan (See Claim 5) show cell phone which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the information limitations of claim 113, Pare, Jr et al (See abstract, Figs. 8-11, 24,25, Col. 11, lines 5-57, Col. 14, lines 32-64,Col. 15, lines 20-35, Col. 18, lines 5-55, claims 1, 4) disclose means for employing transaction employing a biometric input including intermediaries and transmission of verification including user entered PIN(see Col. 6, lines 10-40) that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the information limitations of claim 114, Pare, Jr et al (See abstract, Figs. 8-11, 24,25, Col. 11, lines 5-57, Col. 14, lines 32-64,Col. 15, lines 20-35, Col. 18, lines 5-55, claims 1, 4) disclose means for employing transaction employing a biometric input including intermediaries and transmission of verification including user entered PIN(see Col.

Art Unit: 3621

6, lines 10-40) that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the information limitations of claim 115, Pare, Jr et al (See abstract, Figs. 8-11, 24,25, Col. 11, lines 5-57, Col. 14, lines 32-64, Col. 15, lines 20-35, Col. 18, lines 5-55, claims 1, 4) disclose means for employing transaction employing a biometric input including intermediaries and transmission of verification including user entered account data (see Col. 6, lines 10-40) that is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the database limitations of claim 117, Dulude et al (element 66) or Pare, Jr et al (See Col. 68, lines 30-55) show a database which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the fingerprint limitations of claim 118, Pare, Jr et al (See Col. 13, lines 10-20) show a fingerprint scanner which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the verification limitations of claim 119, Pare, Jr et al (See Fig. 20C) show a verification packet which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the visual limitations of claim 120, Dulude et al (See claim 8) show a database comparison based on biometric generation input and comparison against a stored value which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the verification limitations of claim 121, Pare, Jr et al (See Fig. 20C) show a verification packet which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the database limitations of claim 122, Dulude et al (element 66) or Pare, Jr et al (See Col. 68, lines

Art Unit: 3621

30-55) show a database which is a functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 123, Pare, Jr et al (See abstract, Figs. 8-11, 24,25, Col. 11, lines 5-57, Col. 14, lines 32-64, Col. 15, lines 20-35, Col. 18, lines 5-55, claims 1, 4) disclose means for employing transaction employing a biometric input including intermediaries and transmission of verification substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of specific automatic transmission of a biometric input and point of comparison. It is noted that it is believed that the biometric parameter(See Col. 8, lines 50-55) are functionally equivalent to the claimed limitations and that the claim as drawn is readable on any the well established biometric based transaction methods. Dulude et al(See Fig. 4, Col. 5, lines 50-65, Col. 6, lines 1-25) show biometric inputs at a transaction point transmitted over a network. Kawan (See abstract, Figs. 1-4, 6, Col. 3, lines 1-30, Col. 4, lines 1-15, Col. 8, lines 50-55, claims 1, 5,19) show a means for wirelessly effecting a transaction employing a biometric input. Each of Johnson(element 20), Gerety et al (Fig. 12) or Shinn(Fig. 5) show the local comparison of biometric data prior to a transaction. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Pare, Jr et al because the biometric inputs are conventional functional equivalents with respect to the claim limitations and their employment and comparison is a necessary

Art Unit: 3621

component of validation and use in a transaction method and because local comparison would reduce fraudulent transactions and save network calls for unverified users.

Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Applicants arguments dated 8/22/05 are moot due the new grounds of rejections, which were necessitated by the amendment filed 8/22/05.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

Serial Number: 10/014,112

10

Art Unit: 3621

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building

Serial Number: 10/014,112


11

Art Unit: 3621

401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-5771.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222